

**State of Iowa
Enterprise IT Standards Program**

Centralized Directory Service Standard
Number: S-003-001

**Comments Received during Request for Comment Period
Conducted Oct. 23 – Nov. 6, 2003**

November 7, 2003

Compiled by: Doug Kern

Standards Coordinator

Department of Administrative Services, Policy & Standards Division

Enclosed are the comments received during the enterprise-wide Request for Comment Period conducted from October 23 - November 6, 2003.

Comments Received.

Comment #1.

Submitted by: Department of Human Services.

The following response is on behalf of the DHS Executive Cabinet.

In the current fiscal state of government, any standards or requirements that will impose additional costs to the agencies should be considered carefully. DHS is not in a position to implement unfunded mandates without directly impacting service to our customers. To consider standards that merely provide administrative efficiency and at the expense of the citizens we serve is not supported by the agency.

Directory Standard

State Government in Iowa currently has a common directory available to the agencies in the form of the Hub. Will the creation of this standard provide a better solution or merely a more up-to-date technology? Regardless of the technology, if agencies do not populate the common directory it will not accomplish what I perceive as the intended goal. Do we need a new IT Standard or an administrative directive that agencies utilize what exists today?

Comment #2.

Submitted by: Iowa College Student Aid Commission.

What options will the agencies have to provide their data. Will each agency need to provide an LDAP compatible service that will service requests made by a central directory program, or will sending a text

file in a certain format be acceptable whenever changes are necessary?

Will ITE be aiding in the implementation of this for small agencies with no expertise in this area?

Comment #3.

Submitted by: Dept. of Administrative Services – Information Technology Enterprise.

“The overall objective of this standard is to provide a simplified process to facilitate communication among state agency staff. To accomplish this objective a centralized directory service of all staff will provide a fully populated address book (email/phone #) that is accessible by all agencies.”

The State currently owns and makes available a centralized directory of phone numbers and email addresses in the form of the Iowa Hub. This is an optional service that agencies may elect to participate with, and there is a cost to maintain this service. Because there is no standard that requires all agencies to participate, the value of this centralized directory is limited. In addition the technology used to provide this service is outdated and in need of upgrades.

ITE believes that a consolidated, fully populated directory has tremendous value to the State. ITE favors a standard that establishes provisions for a centralized directory using industry standards and protocols. With one of the requirements of the standard being that the solution is to be “Cost Effective”, ITE would like to remind agencies that a centralized directory exists today. This directory is capable of meeting the requirements set forth – at a minimal cost to participants. That solution is the ITE managed Active Directory. ITE is already synchronizing this directory with the Iowa Hub, and by doing so, we are providing benefits to those agencies that have chosen to participate with the ITE AD Forest. For agencies that wish to develop their own directory infrastructures, ITE can provide a synchronization that would be based upon LDAP protocols. In this way, agencies that have already made an investment in a directory strategy can continue to pursue that direction while also participating in a centralized directory. For those that chose to join the ITE forest the centralized directory is in-place and automatic. For those that are choosing to remain independent, there need only be a directory synchronization established similar to what ITE does with the Iowa Hub today. The costs for this model are staff time to develop and support the scripts for the directory synchronization. An additional option could be to purchase technology to automate this synchronization, such as a meta-directory service.

The above recommendation meets the requirements of “supporting current infrastructure directories and applications” because it still allows agencies to maintain separate and independent infrastructures. There is only a directory synch to deal with. The goal to “consolidate, improve accuracy, and be complete” by containing all staff is not addressed by this standard. Unless there are specific requirements that force

participation, we will not be guaranteed a directory that is any more complete than what we have today with the Iowa Hub.

The contact information would “support accessibility from currently deployed email systems: Outlook, Notes, and GroupWise” because we are proposing synchronization into each agencies native messaging system.

A “unique contact record for state employees and state business representatives” can be accommodated in the proposed solution. ITE is currently synchronizing data using LDAP scripts into the Active Directory from the payroll system as an example of our ability to gather more details about state employees in the Active Directory. This could easily be accomplished for other state agencies as well.

The Active Directory is based upon LDAP standards, and therefore can meet the requirement for such as indicated in the standard.

The solution is cost effective as it leverages an existing investment that ITE and several participating agencies have already made without requiring significant additional investments beyond the coding and support of the synchronization processes.

Comment #4.

Submitted by: Iowa Workforce Development.

IWD supports the CIO introduction section modification to the Centralized Directory Service Standard and requests ITE's draft wording be changed to reflect this modification. We support the standard section as written.

Comment #5.

Submitted by: Iowa Utilities Board (Commerce/Utilities).

The Iowa Hub currently provides a common directory available to the agencies. Perhaps a standard or an administrative directive could encourage or require agencies to utilize what exists today by populating a common set of fields and by including all employees in the directory. Such an approach would achieve the goal of a comprehensive phone/email/location directory without incurring the significant additional costs (both time and money) that are likely to accompany a new or updated directory solution.

Draft version of Centralized Directory Service Standard.

The draft version of the Centralized Directory Service standard that was distributed to the enterprise for comment follows:

Standard:	S-003-001
Technology:	Electronic Directory Services

Category: Centralized Directory Service
Purpose: To determine a centralized directory service strategy for use across the state enterprise.
Effective Date: Upon completion of the IT Standards Adoption Process

Introduction: The overall objective of this standard is to provide a simplified process to facilitate communication among state agency staff. To accomplish this objective a centralized directory service of all staff will provide a fully populated address book (email/phone #) that is accessible by all agencies. Currently the state maintains multiple address / phone books that are not complete and not accessible to everyone. The goal is to consolidate, improve accuracy, and be complete that contains all staff. At a minimum the contact information would need to support accessibility from currently deployed email systems: Outlook, Notes, and GroupWise including a mechanism to synchronize contact information.

The state requires a unique contact record - a digital identity that can include name, phone number, and other identifiers - for state employees and state business representatives. The goal is to create a general-purpose infrastructure, to allow interoperability across processes and technology to meet core business objectives.

Standard: The Directory must meet all the following conditions:

Support current infrastructure directories and applications including the capability to synchronize with other directories such as Microsoft Active Directory, Novell e-directory, and IBM Domino.

Be an open standards based directory compliant with IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) document RFC3377, "Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (v3): Technical Specification", by J. Hodges, R. Morgan. September 2002. (LDAPv3).

Through identity and password tokens, limit who can update an individual contact record, limit who can execute queries against the directory (both internally and externally), limit the types of queries an individual can execute (individual records or global queries).

Be cost effective.